



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,224	03/14/2006	Greg Harris	201144.00002	8390
21324	7590	10/29/2008		
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP				
One GOJO Plaza				
Suite 300				
AKRON, OH 44311-1076				
EXAMINER	LAMB, BRENDA A			
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	1792			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/20/2008	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com  
akron-docket@hotmail.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/532,224	HARRIS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Brenda A. Lamb	1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brenda A. Lamb. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Attorney Schweikert. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 October 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ookouchi et al and Long.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Schweikert called to discuss the rejection of the claims over the prior art as set forth in the last office action. Attorney Schweikert agreed how applicant's invention defines over the art of record. The examiner noted that on page 5 of the last office action that specific suggestions were made to place the application in condition for allowance. Attorney Schweikert indicated that he would be filing an amendment in response to the last office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Brenda A Lamb/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792